

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECURITY INFORMATION

12 January 1952

MINUTES OF 13th CAREER SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING

8 January 1952 - 4:00 P.M.

Present: F. Trubee Davison - AD/Personnel
Matthew Baird - Director of Training
Sherman Kent - Acting AD/ONE
[REDACTED] - OSO
[REDACTED] - Executive Secretary
[REDACTED] Jr. - Consultant

Document No. [REDACTED] Class. [REDACTED]
Change [REDACTED]
Issued To: [REDACTED]
Date: 3-11-78 By: 35

25X1A9A

1. The minutes of the 12th Meeting on 17 December 1951 were approved as distributed.

2. The 2nd draft of the Statement regarding Personnel Policy was discussed and reworded, and the Executive Secretary was directed to circulate a 3rd draft with the Agenda for the next meeting for further consideration with respect to the use to which the Statement on Personnel Policy might be put. There was discussion of the possibility of incorporating it into a proposed "Employees Handbook", a project on which the Personnel Studies and Procedures Staff is believed to be working.

3. The report of the Working Group on Employee Rating, dated 4 January 1952, transmitting the proposed "Personnel Evaluation Report" was discussed. There were distributed to each member of the Committee copies of a minority report by [REDACTED] dated 8 January 1952. The Committee adopted a resolution commending the members of the Working Group on Employee Rating for the care with which the report had been designed as well as for the large amount of work which must have been expended in its preparation in so short a time. Since some doubt was expressed as to whether the other members of the Working Group were acquainted with the minority report, the Chairman of the Committee directed the Executive Secretary to transmit the commendation to the Chairman of the Working Group as well as to insure that copies of the minority report were available to him. There was discussion of the "Personnel Evaluation Report" as follows:

25X1A9A

- a. The Executive Secretary read from the section on Employee Rating in the "Summary of Proceedings of Working Groups", dated 18 December 1951, paragraph 2A, "Primary purpose is to insure to the Agency and the employee the best use of his aptitudes, knowledges, skills, and interests. Evaluation of these factors is the first step for planning a career development system".
- b. There was read from the same report, paragraph 1B "Further discussion on Performance Rating resulted in a recommendation to the Career Service Committee by the Working Group that there be no Performance Rating as such, but there will be a

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP78-04718A000400040072-6

SECURITY INFORMATION

recommended an employee evaluation system which will evaluate every employee. In the evaluation system current job performance would be included as a factor requiring rating by the supervisor in the process of evaluation".

25X1A c. It was pointed out that at the 11th Meeting of the Working Group on 28 December 1951, it had been decided by a vote of 5 to 1 ([REDACTED] dissenting) that "Item 13 [i.e. the list of rating factors] consists of a series of abstract personal qualities rated on a scale which is subject to variable interpretations by people of variable natures" and "This variable form of rating could sabotage all prior written constructive evaluation of the employee since the supervisor might find that discussion with the employee on a basis of comparison with other individuals is more open to objections by the employee with resulting limitations on frank discussion. Where comparisons are not made, the basis of discussion is more constructive and objective".

d. This latter position was supported by the following quotation from the Working Group minutes of the 5th Meeting, paragraph 5 (b) "there must be free discussion between the employee and the supervisor during the preparation of the employee's evaluation".

25X1A9A e. [REDACTED] was asked for his comments and, among other things, he pointed out that in many systems of employee evaluation in industry, the supervisor was asked to examine the employee according to individual characteristics. Where a series of individual characteristics, traits or factors was used, the supervisor was frequently aided in giving a graded rating to a given factor by brief written descriptions of what each gradation of the factor meant. This device is used by the Monsanto Chemical Company and Standard Oil of New Jersey (Esso), and it has been adopted in order to attempt to achieve uniformity of standard. In most cases, in personnel evaluation schemes in industry, the employee is not shown the evaluation. The discussion between the employee and the supervisor takes place after the evaluation has been prepared and after training and guidance has been given to the supervisor.

25X1A9A f. [REDACTED] pointed out that in small overseas stations where social contacts were very close and restricted, freedom of expression might sometimes be inhibited for purely practical consideration. Success of an overseas mission might depend on characteristics or habits of the dependents of the employee. It was agreed that when such a situation occurred, it would have to be handled by separate memorandum through appropriate

SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP78-04718A000400040072-6

~~SECRET~~

SECURITY INFORMATION

channels and not by means of the "Personnel Evaluation Report".

- g. In this connection, there was brief discussion of the desirability of using only one report form for the evaluation of all personnel, both overseas and in headquarters, in order to achieve uniformity of standard and continuity of report. This would not, of course, preclude the use, when necessary, of additional evaluating and reporting techniques to meet special situations.
- h. It was pointed out that the "Personnel Evaluation Report" was designed primarily for the first part of the Career Service Program (i.e. that it "should be equally applied to all (repeat all) staff employees and staff agents of CIA without any distinction as to grade, assignment, length of service, etc.". It was also designed, however, to aid in the second part of the Career Service Program (i.e. "a 'Development Program' for the purpose of insuring to the Agency the best possible use of its available manpower" by exploiting to the fullest the talents and potentialities of proven employees). In view of the request of the Working Group contained in its transmittal Memorandum of 4 January 1952 that the Committee summon the Group for a conference at which background and reasons for the recommendations could be discussed, the Executive Secretary was directed to poll the members of the Committee on Friday, 11 January 1952, with a view to determining if they wished to invite the members of the Working Group to the next meeting on Monday, 14 January 1952.

4. The report of the Working Group on Career Benefits "Career Benefits Desired by CIA", dated 29 December 1951, was discussed and the Executive Secretary was directed to inform the Chairman of the Working Group that the Committee desired that it give first priority to items

- a. (additional pay for hardship and hazard)
- h. (meritorious award for distinguished service)
- i. (establishment of a CIA overseas post classification system with respect to hardship).

This priority was determined since these goals could probably be achieved with the approval of the DCI, but without additional legislation. The Committee also desired that the Working Group suspend activity with respect to item

- f. (the establishment of a "commissioned service").

The Executive Secretary was directed to confer with Mr. Wisner to determine his views on the desirability of a "commissioned service" to be established by legislative action as opposed to the desirability of continuing to operate within the scope of modified Civil Service regulations.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~
SECURITY INFORMATION

There was discussion of whether the report of the Working Group with respect to the requirements for legislative action was, in fact, correct; and as a result, the Chairman of the Committee agreed to confer with Mr. Houston (General Counsel) regarding the validity of the legal aspect of the Working Group's report.


5. The Committee discussed the paper of the Working Group on Selection Criteria "Centralization of Selection for Participation in the CIA Career Service Program", dated 12 December 1951, particularly with respect to the responsibilities, functions and procedures of the Career Service Boards. The Executive Secretary was instructed to inform the Chairman of the Working Group on Selection Criteria that the Committee approved the paper in principle but desired it to work out in greater detail the procedures and mechanics of the Boards.

6. The Committee received the redraft of "Selection Criteria for Participation in CIA Career Service Program" from the Working Group on Selection Criteria and tabled it for further consideration.

7. The next meeting will be held on Monday, 14 January 1952, at 4:00 P.M. in Room 115, North Building.

8. The Meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

25X1A9A



~~SECRET~~